arXiv:1607.00885v6 [math-ph] 17 Mar 2017

A Mysterious Cluster Expansion Associated to the Expectation Value of the Permanent of 0-1 Matrices

Paul Federbush
Department of Mathematics
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI, 48109-1043

March 20, 2017

Abstract

We consider two ensembles of 0-1 $n \times n$ matrices. The first is the set of all $n \times n$ matrices with entries zeroes and ones such that all column sums and all row sums equal r, uniformly weighted. The second is the set of $n \times n$ matrices with zero and one entries where the probability that any given entry is one is r/n, the probabilities of the set of individual entries being i.i.d.'s. Calling the two expectation values E and E_B respectively, we develop a formal relation

$$E(\text{perm}(A)) = E_B(\text{perm}(A))e^{\sum_2 T_i}. \tag{A1}$$

We use two well-known approximating ensembles to E, E_1 and E_2. Replacing E by either E_1 or E_2 we can evaluate all terms in (A1). For either E_1 or E_2 the terms T_i have amazing properties. We conjecture that all these properties hold also for E. We carry through a similar development treating $E(\text{perm}_m(A))$, with m proportional to n, in place of $E(\text{perm}(A))$.

We happily inform the reader that no knowledge of cluster expansions is necessary to read and understand this paper, but for those interested a general exposition is given in [1]. The development of this paper is a short sequence of computational steps. We will clearly state which steps are rigorous and which are formal. There will be no theorems, but the formalism has intrinsic beauty. Our results will be computer computations (in integer arithmetic) of a large number of terms in the developed expansion, that again have a beauty and compelling force for theorems to be proved.

We begin with the definitions of the objects we will deal with. For an $n \times n$ matrix A, in addition to the permanent of A, $\text{perm}(A)$, we will need information about the permanents of submatrices of A. Given a set of i of the rows of A, and a set of i of the columns of A, an $i \times i$ submatrix is determined. The sum of the permanents of all such $i \times i$ submatrices of A we denote by $\text{perm}_i(A)$.

We will consider a number of ensembles of $n \times n$ matrices, each with an associated expectation:

The first ensemble is the set of all 0-1 $n \times n$ matrices with all row and column sums equal to r. We let E denote the expectation determined by a uniform weighting in this ensemble. The expectation $E(\text{perm}_m(A))$ has a natural graph theoretic interpretation. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of r-regular bipartite graphs with $2n$ vertices. To each graph g in $\mathcal{S}$ we associate the cardinality of its symmetry group $cs(g)$. We let $n(m, g)$ be the number of m-matchings on g. Equivalently, $n(m, g)$ may be defined as the number of ways of laying down m dimers on g. Then $E(\text{perm}_m(A))$ is the average value of the ratio $n(m, g)/cs(g)$ over the g in $\mathcal{S}$.

The second is the Bernoulli random matrix ensemble where each entry independently has a probability $p = r/n$ of being one, and is zero otherwise. We denote the associated expectation by E_B.

The third ensemble is the set of nonnegative integer matrices determined by the first measure in Section 4 of [2]. It is in fact determined as a uniformly weighted sum of r independent random permutation matrices. Note that this is not necessarily a set of 0-1 matrices, but all row and column sums equal r. We denote the expectation here by E_1.

The fourth ensemble is again a set of nonnegative integer matrices determined by the second measure in Section 4 of [2]. We denote the associated expectation by E_2. As with E_1, E_2 is developed using random permutation matrices. Here we employ permutations on rn objects. Each single such permutation matrix determines an $n \times n$ matrix and the measure E_2 is the uniform measure on the $(rn)!$ $n \times n$ matrices determined by the $(rn)!$ such permutations. Each permutation is naturally represented as an $rn \times rn$ $0-1$ matrix, A, Entries are said to be in the same residue class if their indices differ by a vector of the form (an, bn) for some integers a and b. The residue classes are in $1-1$ correspondence with indices in the $n \times n$ matrix, B, formed of the first n rows and n columns of the $rn \times rn$ matrix. We take as each entry in this determined matrix, B, the sum of all the entries of A in the same residue class.

We will later work with a matrix A from the first ensemble and B from the second and then use a product expectation

$$E_{\times}(f(A)g(B))) = E(f(A))E_B(g(B)). \tag{1}$$

Our initial object of study is the expectation of the permanent in our first ensemble

$$E(\mathrm{perm}(A)). \tag{2}$$

We write A as a sum

$$A = B + (A - B) \tag{3}$$

where B lies in our second ensemble, and we get

$$E(\mathrm{perm}(A)) = E_{\times}(\mathrm{perm}(B + (A - B))). \tag{4}$$

We write

$$A - B \equiv C \tag{5}$$

and note that

$$E_{\times}(\mathrm{perm}(B + C)) = \sum_{\alpha} E_B(\mathrm{perm}(B_{\bar{\alpha}}))E_{\times}(\mathrm{perm}(C_{\alpha})) \tag{6}$$

where C_α denotes some submatrix of C (obtained by a selection of a set of the columns and an equal-sized set of the rows) and $B_{\bar{\alpha}}$ is the dual submatrix of B (obtained using the complementary sets of rows and columns). The sum over α is over all such submatrices. Equation (6) follows from the definition of the permanent, and the fact that $B_{\bar{\alpha}}$ and C_α are statistically independent.

We now use the very special properties here that the random variables in $B_{\bar{\alpha}}$ are statistically independent from those in C_α , and that the expectations on the right side of (6) each depend only on the size of the respective submatrices. It follows, from these two very special features, that from (6) one gets

$$E(\mathrm{perm}(A)) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} f_i \, E_B(\mathrm{perm}_{n-i}(B))E_{\times}(\mathrm{perm}_i(C)). \tag{7}$$

Here we have set $\mathrm{perm}_n(A) = \mathrm{perm}(A)$ (for $n \times n$ matrices) and $\mathrm{perm}_0(A) = 1$. f_i is 1 over the number of distinct $i \times i$ submatrices:

$$f_i = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{i}^2}. \tag{8}$$

Equation (7) is derived in the Appendix.. But one may check that (6) and (7) are equal, using the special properties above.

We now study $E_\times(\mathrm{perm}_i(C))$. Here we get

$$E_\times(\mathrm{perm}_i(C)) = \sum_{k=0}^{i} f(i,k)\, E(\mathrm{perm}_{i-k}(A))(-1)^k E_B(\mathrm{perm}_k(B)) \tag{9}$$

where

$$f(i,k) = \frac{\binom{n}{i}^2 \binom{i}{k}^2}{\binom{n}{k}^2 \binom{n}{i-k}^2}. \tag{10}$$

We note

$$f_i = f(n,i). \tag{11}$$

We derive equation (9) in the Appendix.

We do a little calculation from the easy formula

$$E_B(\mathrm{perm}_i(B)) = \binom{n}{i}^2 i!\,(r/n)^i \tag{12}$$

to get

$$\frac{E_B(\mathrm{perm}_{n-i}(B))}{E_B(\mathrm{perm}(B))} = \frac{1}{r^i}\frac{n^i(n-i)!}{n!} \cdot \frac{1}{f_i}. \tag{13}$$

We put together the above formulas to get our expression for $E(\mathrm{perm}(A))$:

$$E(\mathrm{perm}(A)) = E_B(\mathrm{perm}(B)) \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} C_i\right) \tag{14}$$

with

$$C_i = \left(\frac{1}{r^i}\frac{n^i(n-i)!}{n!}\right) \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{i} f(i,k)\, E(\mathrm{perm}_{i-k}(A))(-1)^k E_B(\mathrm{perm}_k(B)). \tag{15}$$

We have used the fact that $C_1 = 0$ (and $C_0 = 1$). We emphasize so far that everything is "rigorous", formulae (14) and (15) give a neat expression for $E(\mathrm{perm}(A))$. And also note that all the expectations involving B are easily known by (12).

We now construct our cluster expansion

$$\left(1 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} C_i\right) \text{ “=” } e^{\sum_{i=2}^{\infty} T_i}. \tag{16}$$

This is our first "formal" step. The T_i are selected so that if one expands the two sides in powers of the matrix entries, the two sides are equal power by power. We present the first few T_i so that

one may see the pattern:

$$T_2 = C_2 \tag{17a}$$
$$T_3 = C_3 \tag{17b}$$
$$T_4 = C_4 - \tfrac{1}{2}T_2^2 \tag{17c}$$
$$T_5 = C_5 - T_3T_2 \tag{17d}$$
$$T_6 = C_6 - T_4T_2 - \tfrac{1}{6}T_2^3 - \tfrac{1}{2}T_3^2. \tag{17e}$$

As we mentioned, the terms in (14), (15) in the E_B expectations are all known by (12). Of those in the E expectations the only terms we know exactly are

$$E(\mathrm{perm}_1(A)) = nr \tag{18a}$$
$$E(\mathrm{perm}_2(A)) = \tfrac{1}{2}nr(rn - 2r + 1) \tag{18b}$$
$$E(\mathrm{perm}_3(A)) = \tfrac{1}{6}nr(n^2r^2 - 6nr^2 + 3nr + 10r^2 - 12r + 4) \tag{18c}$$

We are thus motivated to consider the formulas of (14), (15) as developed using E_1 or E_2 instead of E. The formal procedure we followed would have given the same form for (14), (15) with E replaced by either E_1 or E_2. All the expectations using E_1 or E_2 are known from Section 4 of [2] as follows

$$E_1(\mathrm{perm}_m(A)) = \frac{1}{(n!)^r}\binom{n}{m}^2 (m!) \sum_{\substack{m_1,\ldots,m_r\in\mathbb{Z}_+ \\ m_1+\cdots+m_r=m}} \frac{m!(n-m_1)!\cdots(n-m_r)!}{m_1!\cdots m_r!} \tag{19}$$

$$E_2(\mathrm{perm}_m(A)) = \binom{n}{m}^2 \frac{r^{2m}m!(rn-m)!}{(rn)!} \tag{20}$$

Our computer computations support a few amazing conjectures.

Conjecture 1 *Using E_1, E_2, or E we have that the following limit exists:*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}T_i(n). \tag{21}$$

One will realize that the existence of the limit in (21) is amazing if one considers that the $C_i(n)$ may behave proportional to $n^{i/2}$ for large n (by computer computation), so much cancellation must take place for the limit in (21) to exist.

Conjecture 2 *The limits obtained using E_1, E_2, or E equal eachother:*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}T_i(n) \equiv Q_i = \sum_k \frac{a_k(i)}{r^k} \tag{22}$$

with $i - 1 \geq k \geq h(i)$, where $h(i) = i/2$ if i is even and $= (i+1)/2$ if i is odd.

We present the first few computed Q_i.

$$Q_2 = \frac{1/2}{r} \tag{23}$$

$$Q_3 = \frac{2/3}{r^2} \tag{24}$$

$$Q_4 = -\frac{1/2}{r^2} + \frac{5/4}{r^3} \tag{25}$$

$$Q_5 = -\frac{2}{r^3} + \frac{14/5}{r^4} \tag{26}$$

$$Q_6 = \frac{5/6}{r^3} - \frac{7}{r^4} + \frac{7}{r^5} \tag{27}$$

$$Q_7 = \frac{6}{r^4} - \frac{24}{r^5} + \frac{132/7}{r^6} \tag{28}$$

We turn to the treatment of $E(\mathrm{perm}_m(A))$, where the development above with minimal modification leads to the replacement of (14) and (15) by

$$E(\mathrm{perm}_m(A)) = E_B(\mathrm{perm}_m(B)) \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \hat{C}_i\right) \tag{29}$$

with

$$\hat{C}_i = \left(\frac{1}{r^i} \frac{n^i m!((n-i)!)^2}{(m-i)!(n!)^2}\right) \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{i} f(i,k)\, E(\mathrm{perm}_{i-k}(A))(-1)^k E_B(\mathrm{perm}_k(B)). \tag{30}$$

We let m be proportional to n, so

$$m = \alpha n \tag{31}$$

$\hat{T}_i$ is introduced parallel to T_i. We propose the following modified forms of Conjectures 1 and 2.

Conjecture 3 *Using E_1, E_2, or E we have that the following limit exists:*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \hat{T}_i(n). \tag{32}$$

Conjecture 4 *The limits obtained using E_1, E_2, or E equal eachother:*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \hat{T}_i(n) \equiv \hat{Q}_i(r) = \alpha\, Q_i(r/\alpha) \tag{33}$$

Most recently, in [3], Mario Pernici has proven Conjectures 1 and 2 for $i \leq 7$. He uses an expansion developed by I.M. Wanless in [4].

Using (12),(18).(19),(20) we have checked the following by algebraic (rigorous) computation:
1) Conjecture 3 holds for E if $i \leq 3$, Conjecture 1 for E_1 if $i \leq 34$, and for E_2 if $i \leq 42$, and Conjecture 3 for E_1 and E_2 if $i \leq 22$.
2) For $i \leq 34$, Q_i has the same value for E_1 and E_2.
3) For $i \leq 42$, Q_i for E_2 has the form given in Conjecture 2, and for $i \leq 34$, Q_i for E_1 has the form given in Conjecture 2.
4) Conjecture 4 holds for E if $i \leq 3$, for E_1 and E_2 if $i \leq 22$.

I For $r = 2$ one can calculate $\frac{1}{n} T_i(n)$ exactly for reasonably large values of n (for measure E!). We have used a form of extrapolation to take the limit in Conjecturer 2. One takes a ratio of quadratic polynomials in n and fits it for five values of n then taking the limit n goes to infinity in the ratio, a form of Pade approximant. We present in summary form the results of Mario Pernici using the same form of Pade approximant fixing values at some five element subset of $n = 50, 55, 60, 65, 70, 75, 80$ in each case, up to $i = 25$, with a relative error less than

10^{-4} for $i \leq 10$, less than $6 \cdot 10^{-3}$ for $i \leq 20$. We view these computations as very consistent with Conjectures 1 and 2.

We now numerically study the $r = 2$, $\alpha = .7$ case for $i = 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 15$, parallel to where we treated the $r = 2$, $\alpha = 1$ case previously. As before we have approximated in each of these cases $\frac{1}{n}\hat{T}_i(n)$ by a ratio of quadratic polynomials in n, fitting the values at $n = 15, 20, 25, 30, 35$. We thus found approximate values $-.00536, -.0306, -.0228, .000942, -.00443, .0151$ for the limits of $\frac{1}{n}\hat{T_4}(n), \frac{1}{n}\hat{T_5}(n), \frac{1}{n}\hat{T_6}(n), \frac{1}{n}\hat{T_7}(n), \frac{1}{n}\hat{T_{10}}(n), \frac{1}{n}\hat{T_{15}}(n)$. The limiting values for these quantities using E_1 or E_2 are to the number of places indicated -.00536, -.0306, -.0228, -.000945,-.00444,.0135. This leads us, consistent with above, to expect that the $\hat{Q}_i$ for E agree with the $\hat{Q}_i$ of E_1 and E_2.

We now assume

$$\lim \frac{1}{n} \sum \hat{T_i} = \sum \lim \frac{1}{n} \hat{T_i}, \tag{34}$$

our second formal step.

As is usual in studying cluster expansions one studies the $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}(\ )$. One can show for $s = 1, 2$ that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} ln(E_s(\mathrm{perm}_m(A))) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} ln(E_B(\mathrm{perm}_m(A))) + \alpha + (r - \alpha) \ln\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{r}\right) \tag{35}$$

where as before $m = \alpha n$. A proof for E_1 is found in [2]. Ideally we would want

$$\sum \hat{Q}_i = \alpha + (r - \alpha) \ln\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{r}\right) \tag{36}$$

From a little numerical investigation we believe that

$$\sum \hat{Q}_i \sim \alpha + (r - \alpha) \ln\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{r}\right) \tag{37}$$

where more explicitly one wants for each integer n that

$$\sum^{n} \hat{Q}_i = \alpha + (r - \alpha) \ln\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{r}\right) + \mathcal{O}(1/(r)^{(n+1)/2}) \tag{38}$$

as r goes to infinity.

There is some evidence that for each r there is an $\alpha_0(r) > 0$ such that if $\alpha < \alpha_0(r)$ then (36) holds.

At the bottom there is a mystery. What theoretical mechanism gives rise to the structure of this cluster expansion?

Acknowledgement We thank Mario Pernici for pointing out some errors in an original form of this paper, as well as helping with some of the computer calculations.

Appendix

We will derive eq.(9), eq.(7) being a special case of eq.(9). We work in a slightly different setting than in the paper, but one having the same computational details. We have a measure space with expectation, *e*. A, B, and C are $n \times n$ matrices whose entries are random variables. We assume $A = B + C$ and that the entries of B are statistically independent of those of C. Greek letters label a subset of the indices of the rows and an equal sized subset of the columns. If there

are r elements in each of the subsets determined by α, then A_α is an $r \times r$ submatrix of A, and we write $s(\alpha) = r$. We assume

$$e(perm(A_\alpha)) = a(s(\alpha)) \tag{39}$$

$$e(perm(B_\alpha)) = b(s(\alpha)) \tag{40}$$

$$e(perm(C_\alpha)) = c(s(\alpha)) \tag{41}$$

That is, the expectations of the permanent of a submatrix of a given matrix depends only on the size of the submatrix. We note then

$$e(perm_m(A)) = \binom{n}{m}^2 a(m) \tag{42}$$

$$e(perm_m(B)) = \binom{n}{m}^2 b(m) \tag{43}$$

$$e(perm_m(C)) = \binom{n}{m}^2 c(m) \tag{44}$$

Analagous to eq.(6) we have that

$$perm(B_\gamma + C_\gamma) = \sum_{\alpha \subset \gamma} perm(B_\alpha) perm(C_{\bar{\alpha}}) \tag{45}$$

where $\bar{\alpha}$ is the set of indices of rows and columns inside the sets γ complementary to the rows and columns of α. Taking expectations., and setting $s \equiv s(\gamma)$, we get

$$a(s) = \sum_{i=0}^{s} \binom{s}{i}^2 b(i) c(s-i). \tag{46}$$

Substituting (42)-(44) into (46) we obtain eq(9).

References

[1] Brydges, D., A short course on cluster expansions, *Phénomènes critiques, systèmes aléatoires, théories de gauge*, Parts I, II (Les Houches, 1984), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986, pp. 129–183,

[2] Friedland, S. and Krop, E. and Markström, K., *On the number of matchings in regular graphs*, Electron. J. Combin., **15** (2008), pp. 1–28.

[3] Pernici, M., *1/n expansion for the number of matchings on regular graphs and monomer-dimer entropy.*

[4] Wanless, I.M., *Counting Matchings and Tree-like Walks in Regular Graphs*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing **19** (2010), 463.